

District IV Citizen Review Panel
707 N. Armstrong Pl, Boise, ID 83704
Wednesday, November 4th, 2020
4:00 pm – 6:00 pm

Join Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87449110153>

Meeting ID: 874 4911 0153

One tap mobile: +16699006833,,87449110153# US
Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/km2v1Mpl4>

Meeting Minutes

In attendance

Members: Allison Berkson, Brian McCauley, Shannon McCarthy, Kym Nilsen, Darcie Bobrowski.
Melissa Mezo, Nicole Noltensmeyer entered at 4:17pm

Staff: Misty Myatt (IDHW) Laura Smith and Courtney Boyce (CDH)

Guests: Darci Anderson (CASA, Family Advocates), Nicky Flock (IDHW), Britney Journee (TRHS)

Call Meeting to Order

Motion: Brian made a motion to approve meeting minutes as presented.

Shannon seconded. None opposed, the motion carries. The meeting minutes from the October meeting are approved as presented.

Motion: Brian made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Shannon seconded. None opposed, the motion carries. The November meeting agenda is approved as written.

Introduction: Nicky Flock

Nicky Flock has been the program manager for Region IV for a little over a year. Nicky shared that she has been practicing social work for 20+ years. Nicky shared her work history in in juvenile corrections, as a school social worker, as a victim witness coordinator with Boise Police Department. and work in child protection with IDHW in safety/case management. Nicky shared that she has been working with vulnerable populations in different systems.

Brian thanked Nicky for attending. Brian recognized the additional guests to the meeting and encouraged them to introduce themselves.

Britney Journee is a previous guest and presenter at District IV Citizen Review Panel meetings. Britney is the Associate Director of Behavioral Health with Terry Reilly Health Services & SANE Solutions and a Licensed Clinical Professional Counselor

Britney's specialties include sexual abuse trauma, providing therapy and psychoeducation for children and adults involved in the foster care system, and therapy for children with problem sexual behaviors. Britney oversees and provides supervision and training for twenty trauma and general behavioral health therapists at Terry Reilly Health Services. Britney identified extensive experience working with foster and foster-adopted children, ongoing interactions with the IDHW and foster parents. Britney identified that she has 15 years of experience, and been with TRHS for twenty years.

Valley County Update

Kym provided a brief update on Valley County and her work in the area. Kym concentrated this month on an interview with Detective David Brock, after speaking with Dispatch for 20-30 minutes. Kym shared that it is her impression that when a case comes in from any direction, a neighbor call-in or school – they send out a deputy that is on at the time that conducts an initial assessment. If it needs to go a step further it will go to the detective, if child is in imminent danger and call will go to IDHW. Essentially, the response is determined based on the allegation. Kym shared that it appears they are cautious in getting things moving because they don't want to put a family into a cycle unless it is deemed to be warranted, airing on the side of caution versus progress. Kym also shared that there did not appear to be a consistent protocol for how concerns were addressed and/or reported. Kym is working with a social worker in Valley County to conduct her evaluations. This social worker talked to two teachers including a board member at the McCall-Donnelly School District. The outcome of this conversation also indicated that those teachers feel they do not get feedback, response, and don't know the outcome of the report. Due to privacy concerns they may not receive feedback but they are still observing the same issues. Kym identified that there appears to be a conflict about who has the ownership of the safety concern and the responsibility of who manages it.

Misty Myatt shared that in the State of Idaho every person that is 18 years of age or older is a mandatory reporter. Misty shared that the knowledge of abuse or neglect should be called into IDHW to make a referral. Misty shared there is a caveat as school districts have different procedures. Misty shared that it is her understanding that in McCall-Donnelly School District their procedures regarding abuse or neglect, should be in partnership with the principal, and then make a call to IDHW to ultimately be screened by Central Intake for priority assignment.

The discussion continued that with the calls to the Sheriff's office they are responded to by law enforcement, however there needs to be collaboration and education to know who and when to call. A concern was identified is that when directly calling law enforcement and they do their own assessment without coordinating with IDHW, it depends on the outcome. If in their eyes it does not need IDHW's level of involvement it could be based on their standards, but not the Department's.

Kym shared that she feels the missing link in Valley County seems to be that after the designated IDHW worker was taken out, there was no protocol left, as there wasn't anyone to tie anything together. Kym shared concerns from those interviewed that cases of concern are not being followed up with appropriately. The group discussed that if the teachers go to the principal in the school does that violate the state statute of mandatory reporting and does that alleviate the teacher from liability from being a mandatory reporter.

Group Home Update

Nicole identified we have not received any communication from IDHW on the urgent recommendations. The timeline for the response was 30 days, and at the time of this meeting it has been less than 30 days

from the time of submission to the Department. Nicole discussed out of state placements, and interstate compact for the placement of children and how these cases are viewed from the Department. Misty clarified that they would keep the case open until resolved. Misty discussed that when the tableau of case reviews was created for CRP members, cases were not pulled that went past 18 months. Misty shared that developers are working on those cases, and Roxanne Printz is working on that issue with the developers. This means that there are potentially other cases that are under the review of the CRP that they have not had access to.

Allison asked if those cases could be ones that the CRP members could access physically, if someone wanted to come down to Central Office to review. Misty said there should be procedures or processes in place where staff would make that case review. Nicole stated that this was done for her previously. Misty stated the difference now is that everything lives in e-Cabinet, and that access for case workers is different than the CRP access. She said that is why someone would need to sit in there, so that the documents that are being shared are the ones that everyone has access to. Brian inquired about documents that the CRP doesn't have access to and referenced state code, as there is not supposed to be any documentation withheld from CRP. Misty provided examples of documentation that do not technically belong to the IDHW, as it is not their property to release. Any example of this could be letters from children to their parents. Misty stated that this documentation, as an example, does not pertain to vase reviews and would have third-party information. For this example, if a child writes a letter, they would scan that letter and it would be placed into e-Cabinet. Another example if there were additional testing or evaluations that was not done through the department, and foster parent correspondence to case workers. This could also include case management notes and narratives, that may contribute to the comprehensive review of the cases. This was asked to be considered. Misty was asked to follow up with Roxanne to provide an ETA to the District IV Citizen Review Panel on cases that are not currently available to the CRP members through the technology they have access to.

Statewide CRP Objectives

Brian discussed two major project ideas, the second of which is in the next agenda item.

The first was from a proposal out of Idaho District V's Citizen Review Panel. Brian discussed that this proposal included creating regional therapeutic intake centers where every child would be brought into. They would receive standardized levels of care before put into a foster home, and receive evaluations/assessments. This center could address delays into treatment and mitigate additional trauma.

From the September 2nd Statewide CRP Conference Call Meeting Minutes:

District 5's CRP proposal to the Legislative Oversight committee: a shelter/care assessment center.

- a. 4-week intake center where [in-house] assessments are done
- b. where education & counseling for child and family members can be started
- c. where providers/professionals can work to provide assessments
- d. where child's unique needs can be assessed to better match child to foster family
- e. where plan can be developed that will assist bio family, foster family & school
- f. one each in district/region
- g. vision is for an environment with the look and feel of home
- h. goal is to speed up the process for the child

Brian discussed that this proposal could be a project of the CRP and be brought back to the Department. Brian shared that some of the exploratory work from the Panel would include a business plan, model for assessment, model for actual operations/community participants/partners, and management of the center. Brian stated that this work would help bring together a state-level idea that would be a functional solution to help solve and standardize the assessment of children. Brian said if there was interest he could get them into contact with the regional contact. Nicole shared interest in working in the short term placement facility project.

Reunification & Best Interest of the Child Legislation Discussion

Brian discussed the second project idea. This project came from a discussion from Ada County law enforcement at a previous meeting. Brian proposed that we work on legislation that clarifies how child protection cases and criminal cases run parallel together, and how this may not be in the best interest of the child. Brian shared that there could be situations where these cases are being addressed separately and could further re-traumatize the child.

Shannon shared that should contribute to this project, by lending her expertise and legal lens.

Darcie said that she could help here in this area, including phone calls and networking.

Allison shared she would be interested in the second project, not sure if she would have much input other than specific communication areas in the cases that she has reviewed.

Reporting Responsibility Conflict

Brian shared that this is what was being discussed in Valley County. In hearing Valley County's procedures and policies, and with law enforcement's input from last month, Brian believes that he believes these entities are competing without having a single source. The Panel including Misty discussed accountability and responsibility of the cases. Brian also discussed how the prioritization of the cases determines how the case is handled from the IDHW, but does not always require the coordination or collaboration of law enforcement. The Panel discussed how jurisdiction is determined based on where the parents reside, for example, in the case of a child testing positive for illicit substances after being born. Brian inquired of Misty how the Department would handle a case in the instance where no address has been provided. In this hypothetical situation of a child testing positive for substances when there is no address that has been provided, who would be responding to the case at a time when jurisdiction is not determined. Misty responded by providing an example of a referral of sexual abuse. If there is no known location of the incident where it occurred, but the family lived in Ada County it would be coordinated in Ada until if they determine that the abuse occurred in a different county, and then a detective would be assigned to the case from the county where it occurred.

Action Item: Brian asked Shannon to follow-up with the definition of jurisdiction.

Darci Anderson from Family Advocates shared her thoughts on this topic and spoke about how there were no new child protection cases in Adams, Valley, Camas and Blaine. Darci will re-share the report that this information is from to the Panel. Courtney previously e-mailed this report to the group, and will ensure it is sent again.

Melissa discussed the lack of communication from Boise County after e-mailing the Boise County Sherriff. This was her follow-up from the previous meeting and she wanted to make sure it was addressed with the Panel. Misty discussed the connection of Detective Gomez the SRO in Boise County and how she will send their contact information to Melissa.

Darci Anderson shared that there were 15 children on their watch list in Boise County, and when meeting they identified that at least five of those children needed referrals. Melissa has a good understanding of that community having been a previous resident, including connections to different areas. Melissa discussed she is just hoping for feedback and communication to support the work that is being done.

Discuss Coordination with IDHW & CDH Role

Brian discussed a meeting with the IDHW from CDH that was made without the CRP's knowledge. Brian shared that the CRP would like communication and express approval before coordinating meetings in the future, and that if the CRP chooses to have active coordination with the Department they should decide how/when/with whom that should happen.

Courtney clarified that her position as a public health district liaison is not subject to the District IV Citizen Review Panel bylaws, as she is not a member. Courtney also shared that the meeting she had with the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare is not subject to Open Meeting Law, in reference to Idaho Code 74-202, found here:

<https://legislature.idaho.gov/statutesrules/idstat/Title74/T74CH2/SECT74-202/>.

Courtney shared that there have not been established guidelines set forth from CDH or any other public health district based on her knowledge when asking other districts, about the roles, responsibilities and job details of her position. Courtney requested that this was an opportunity for the CRP to formally establish what that this role looks like, and she can navigate this position within the framework that they have established and consented to.

Brian discussed that the CRP will work on a framework for this position, and if meetings are held with the Department the need for CRP representation to be there. This could be an additional responsibility of a member of the CRP. Brian shared that Allison could be the liaison for the CRP, as her background and experience make a good fit.

Motion: Nicole made a motion for a standing invite to Roxanne/Miren to invite them to quarterly meetings. Alison seconded. None opposed, the motion carries.

Courtney identified that this motion could be amended to be clear about the timeline for invitations.

Motion: Nicole amended the previous motion, to invite Roxanne and/or Miren to the final District IV Citizen Review Panel meeting of each quarter. Melissa seconded. None opposed, the motion carries. Miren and Roxanne will be invited to the District IV Citizen Review Panel meetings, on December 1st, 2020, March 2nd, 2021, June 1st, 2021 and September 7, 2021.

CRP Independent Branding / Member Representation

This portion of the agenda discussed independent representation from the District IV Citizen Review Panel when submitting reports, agendas, and all other formal documentation. Laura shared that this was recently done at CDH, at around \$700. This process of branding would be working with a designer, with the cost of the templates and invoice paid using District IV Citizen Review Panel funds. These funds are used to support this position at CDH, and available with the consent of the Panel for these purposes. Through this designer, the CRP could receive templates for a letter head, logo, and/or powerpoint if they should like. The conversation proceeded to discuss funds for the CRP, and not knowing how much funds were available. In order to be transparent with the Panel members, to make this and other fiscally-related decisions in the future, CDH will provide a template of estimated budgets to see where CRP funds are being spent. This will be an estimate as receipts, invoices, and hours from the previous month are calculated the following month. Brian shared that this could be part of the Call Meeting to Order portion of the agenda as a brief review of funds. Brian asked if the CRP would need approval to go through the CDH process of billing for a designer, if they went another avenue. Laura clarified that if CDH was not exchanging funds for a service, then it would not need to go through that billing avenue. Brian requested that the CRP members follow up with any designer friends or community members to scout around to see if anyone would be willing to compile a logo for the District IV Citizen Review Panel.

Action Item:

Courtney will compile a budget for the CRP members to see where CRP funds are being spent.

Case Reviews

The Panel discussed several recent incidents where there were incomplete records when conducting case reviews. Misty encouraged the Panel members to communicate with her should this occur, as IDHW needs to be informed about gaps in case reviews given the transfer of recent technology using

this interface. Misty shared that she would want to be looped in about that process, so she has requested CRP inform her about issues with the technology and then she will forward them to the IT department. Brian requested the format of this communication. Misty said that the case number, and the document that they are trying to access, and if possible, a screen shot and/or error message so they can know the extent of the issue.

Brian discussed the Panel's efforts in reviewing cases where foster children were placed into group and/or residential treatment programs. Brian discussed criteria for placement into a group home. Misty stated that the documentation should be in the court documents on the current placement, but believes Brian is asking how is that decision staffed or made for final approval. Brian asked if there were criteria for caseworkers, and asked what direction does the Department give the caseworkers to help guide them in this decision. Misty stated that anytime that the child enters a higher level of care (ex. behavioral health hospital) those children are staffed at an administrative level and then approved at that level. Those conversations have to be documented but the CRP does not have access to those documents. Misty indicated that they include criminal history, prior placements, assessment of mental health, account for risk to themselves/others in the community, hospitalizations, etc. Misty said that they take a lot of information into consideration when we are making a higher-level recommendation including placement. The Panel discussed conditions that were found in case reviews from Melissa and Shannon that were a brief summary to the court, based on recommendations. It was shared that despite not seeing the clear guidelines in the text, panel members with clinical behavioral health experience may be able to extrapolate that information from the case reviews. It was also discussed that children placed in higher-levels of care are staffed at minimum once every 30 days. Some of the other factors taken into consideration include what are the recent behaviors including any escalations (ex. visit, traumatic event that just occurred). They have to identify if there is a trigger versus a more global picture with that child that might need more specific treatment. This includes drug or alcohol issues, self-harm concerns or harm others in the community and working through those pieces to staff those cases appropriately. This includes identifying how to mitigate some of those concerns to keep a child in the home safely.

It was asked if the Department has a standard treatment model for homes, including in the management of those children. Misty shared that the facility must match the need, including the treatment model for the preferred case plan and bed availability. Misty discussed that this also includes monthly consultations with the multidisciplinary team, to discuss the treatment at the facility, what needs aren't being met, and how are they are working towards discharge. Misty said that the Department doesn't want long-term institutional or long-term facility placements, but sometimes that occurs due to lack of progress or plans for step down hospitalization. Misty also said that depending on the concern from the facility, if it is an abuse or neglect concern, it needs to be reported to Intake. Otherwise if it is a licensing issue, it needs to be addressed with the licensing agent. Depending on the concern (abuse or neglect – needs to reported to intake) licensing issue needs to addressed with the licensing agent.

Allison asked Misty if she could tell her what Gem State Shelter Homes and Treasure Valley Transition Center are. When they are talked about in reports, they are referred to as "Foster Parent" as opposed to group home, so she was unclear on what they are. Misty stated that Gem State is a short-stay (up to 14 days) shelter home. Treasure Valley Transition Home is a group home for adolescent males that really focuses on independent living skills and transitions out of foster care.

The Panel addressed the gap of how do we properly need the high-risk children in foster homes before sending them to residential treatment facilities. Alison discussed that these high needs may be created created due to lack of resources/prevention from the beginning. It was also shared that Pride Training might not be equipping foster parents with the tools that they need.

Nicole discussed idea of having weekend meeting as an all-day meeting as the group receives momentum and then has to adjourn. This will be discussed further at the next meeting.

For December and January agenda items, it was tentatively discussed to include the following:

The projects proposed at this meeting including:

- Region V's shelter/care assessment center

 - Nicole volunteered to assist

- Best Interest of the Child Legislation

 - Shannon, Darcie, and Allison volunteered to assist

- Defined Role of CDH – 15 min

- CRP Member Liaison – 15min

- CRP Budget – 10min

- Weekend Meeting – 5min

- Roxanne/Miren Discussion – 45min

- CRP Independent Branding?

January Meeting could include a roll-over of previous agenda items, in addition to:

- Valley County Updates with Kym

- Boise County Representative

Agendas are posted to the District IV Citizen Review Panel's page through Central District Health and CDH's Meeting Room Hallway, in accordance with Open Meeting Law.

Adjourn

Brian McCauley, the Chair of the District IV Citizen Review Panel, adjourned the meeting at 6:15pm.

Meeting minutes prepared by Courtney Boyce.